

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
09/819,731	03/29/2001	Masayoshi Shimizu	826.1719 4353			
21171 7:	590 02/24/2006		EXAMINER			
STAAS & HA	ALSEY LLP		DESIRE, GR	EGORY M		
	RK AVENUE, N.W.		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER			
WASHINGTO	•		2627			
			D. 1777 14 11 777 00 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	DATE MAIL ED 00/04/000/		

DATE MAILED: 02/24/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

DATE MAILED:

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR / PATENT IN REEXAMINATION		ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	
·			EXAMINER	
		ART UNIT	PAPER	
			20060207	
		PATENT IN REEXAMINATION	PATENT IN REEXAMINATION ART UNIT	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner for Patents

- 1. Response to telephone communication with Mr. Randall Fisher (Applicant's representative) on 1/31/06, attached is a replacement of a previous office action mailed 12/1/05.
- 2. The period for response of three (3) months set in said office action is restarted to begin with the mailing date of this letter.
- 3. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gregory M. Desire whose telephone number is (571) 272-7449. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (6:30-3:00). If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bhavesh Mehta can be reached on (571) 272-7453. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

gmd 2/7/06

Gregory Desire
Patent Examiner

MATTHEW C. BELLA SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600

Marche Bella

		Application	on No.	Applicant(s)					
Office Action Summary		09/819,73	31	SHIMIZU ET AL.					
		Examiner		Art Unit					
		Gregory M	I. Desire	2627					
The MAIL Period for Reply	ING DATE of this communicati	on appears on the	cover sheet with the	correspondence ad	ldress				
THE MAILING D - Extensions of time rr after SIX (6) MONTH - If the period for reply - If NO period for reply - Failure to reply within Any reply received b	STATUTORY PERIOD FOR INTERPOLATE OF THIS COMMUNICAT way be available under the provisions of 37 is from the mailing date of this communical specified above is less than thirty (30) day its specified above, the maximum statutory in the set or extended period for reply will, by the Office later than three months after the djustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	FION. CFR 1.136(a). In no evention. s, a reply within the state, period will apply and wing statute, cause the apply	ent, however, may a reply be tin story minimum of thirty (30) day Il expire SIX (6) MONTHS from ication to become ABANDONE	nely filed /s will be considered timel I the mailing date of this c ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).					
Status									
1) Responsiv	e to communication(s) filed or	n <u>31 January 200</u>	<u>6</u> .						
2a)⊠ This action		This action is n							
•									
Disposition of Clair	ms								
4a) Of the 5)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1</u> 6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>8</u> 7)□ Claim(s) _	4) Claim(s) 1-3, 5-17 and 24-25 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) Claim(s) 1-3,5-7,24 and 25 is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 8-23 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.								
Application Papers									
10) The drawin Applicant m Replaceme	cation is objected to by the Exg(s) filed on <u>24 March 2001</u> is ay not request that any objection at drawing sheet(s) including the redeclaration is objected to by	dare: a)⊠ accept to the drawing(s) b correction is require	e held in abeyance. Se ed if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ejected to. See 37 Cl	FR 1.121(d).				
Priority under 35 U	.S.C. § 119								
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 									
	son's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-9 ure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/		4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:	ate. <u>1/31/06</u> .	O-152)				

Art Unit: 2627

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communication filed 8/24/05.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 8-12, and 14-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakajima in view of Yanagida and further view of Shiiyama. Regarding claims 8 and 15-17 Nakajima discloses,

A user corrected image-obtaining unit outputting a predetermined image (note col. 19 lines 31-35, nine different adjustment patterns examiner interprets as two or more correction levels), and allowing a user to correct the output image (note col. 19 lines 35-48, user selects a preferred corrected image)

Image correction unit, correcting an image to be corrected which is different from the predetermined image based on a correction result of the user (Once a adjustment value is set automatic correction of the level occurs, thus correcting an image to be corrected different from predetermined image (note col. 31 lines 1-6). Nakajima is silent disclosing a correction preferred by a group of people. However, Yanagida discloses designating device, designating an individual or group. Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skills in the art to include designating device of Yanagida

Page 3

Art Unit: 2627

in the system of Nakajima. Nakajima teaches a user correcting images and selecting preferences. Yanagida in the same field of endeavor allows for a simple way for designating image processing (note col. 1 lines 60-65).

Nakajima and Yanagida do not clearly disclose output of predetermined image widely preferred among a large number of people. Shiiyama discloses output image based on number of votes (note col. 4 lines 1-10). Nakajima, Yanagida and Shiiyama are combinable because they disclose storing image data. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to select an image widely preferred among a large number of people in the system of Nakajima and Yanagida as evidenced by Shiiyama. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been sorting display image results giving priority to frequently viewed images (note col. 1 lines 25-30). Therefore it would have been obvious to combine Nakajima and Yanagida with Shiiyama to obtain the invention as specified in the above claim.

Regarding claim 9 Nakajima, Yanagida and Shiiyama discloses,

Wherein said user preference obtaining unit outputs images at two or more correction levels corresponding to the plurality of given images to allow the user to select preferred corrected images (note Nakajima fig. 24a and 24b in connection with col. 20 lines 40-50). Nine thumbnail images correspond to the two or more correction levels and block 165 (scene) provides plurality of given images to allow the user to select preferred corrected images.

Art Unit: 2627

Regarding claim 10 Nakajima, Yanagida and Shiiyama discloses,

Wherein said plurality or given images are different in type (note Nakajima col. 20 lines 48-50, shows image different in type), and said user preference obtaining unit allows the user to selects preferred corrected image corresponding to each type (note Nakajima col. 20 line 44-47).

Regarding claim11 Nakajima, Yanagida and Shiiyama discloses,

A user specified image input unit receiving a user specified image as the given image (note Nakajima fig. 24b block 165 and col. 20 lines 40-45, sample is user specified image input unit receiving a use specified image).

Regarding claims 12 Nakajima, Yanagida and Shiiyama discloses,

Wherein said given image is stored in advance in an image correction unit as an image of quality generally preferred by a large number of users (note Nakajima col. 20 line 18-20, lines cite image prepared beforehand).

Regarding claim 14 Nakajima, Yanagida and Shiiyama discloses,

Wherein said user preference obtaining unit prints and outputs images at two or more correction level (note Nakajima col. 19 lines 38-40, user prints nine images of different adjusting parameters (two or more correction levels); and

Art Unit: 2627

Apparatus further comprises an image-printing unit printing and outputting an image to be corrected, which has actually been corrected by said image correction unit (note Nakajima col. 19 lines 41-48).

4. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakajima and Yanagida in view of Kanno et al (6,577,761).

Regarding claim13 Nakajima, Yanagida and Shiiyama are silent disclosing,

Wherein said user preference obtaining unit requests a user t input a user identifier for identification of the user, and allows each user to select a preferred corrected image. However, Kanno discloses user inputs identifier and allows each user to select a preferred corrected image (note col. 12 lines 42-47 and 54-60, user inputs user identification, allows user to select an output image).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skills in the art to include user identification in the system of Nakajima, Yanagida and Shiiyama as evidenced by Kanno. Nakajima as modified teach user selection of a corrected preferred image and setting the select preference for other images. Kanno in the same field of endeavor identifies specific user of an output image, thus providing and maintaining the preference of a specific user of a system operated by many user (note col. 1 lines 61-66).

Allowable Subject Matter

5. Claims 1-3, 5-7 and 24-25 are allowed.

Art Unit: 2627

6. The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance: for independent claims 1, 24 and 25. The prior art fails to teach a plurality of corrected image variation of a given image, the variation corrected images including one representing the corrected image of a quality preferred widely among a large number of people and having been stored in said image correction apparatus. Claims 2-3 and 5-7 depend on claim1. Therefore are also allowable.

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

Conclusion

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

Art Unit: 2627

a - - - - -

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gregory M. Desire whose telephone number is (571) 272-7449. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (6:30-3:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bhavesh Mehta can be reached on (571) 272-7453. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Gregory M. Desire Examiner Art Unit 2627

G.D. February 7, 2006

MATTHEW C. BELLA SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600

Marker (Bella